Chariton

Chariton Muni
Iowa
VOR/RWY 17 ORIG...
Effective: 01/28/92
FDC 2/0501/CNC/FI/P Chariton Muni, Chariton, IA. VOR RWY 17 ORIG... MSA from DSM VORTAC 090–270 2800. Cancel TRML RTES DSM R–079, R–189 17 DME ARC to JAMIS. Delete note... Activate MIRL RWY 17/35 CTAF. This becomes VOR/RWY 17 ORIG–A.

Chariton

Chariton Muni
Iowa
NDB/RWY 17 AMDT 2...
Effective: 01/29/92
FDC 2/0502/CNC/FI/P Chariton Muni, Chariton, IA. NDB RWY 17 AMDT 2... MSA from CNC NDB 2800. Delete note... Activate MIRL RWY 17/35 CTAF. This becomes NDB/RWY 17 AMDT 2A.

Forest City

Forest City Muni
Iowa
VOR/DME–A AMDT 2A...
Effective: 01/28/92
FDC 2/0503/FXY/FI/P Forest City Muni, Forest City, IA. VOR/DME–A AMDT 2A...Add note... Circling to RWY 27 NA at night. This becomes VOR/DME–A AMDT 2B.

Forest City

Forest City Muni
Iowa
NDB/RWY 33 ORIG A...
Effective: 01/29/92
FDC 2/0504/FXY/FI/P Forest City Muni, Forest City, IA. NDB RWY 33 ORIG A...Add note... Circling to RWY 27 NA at night. This becomes NDB/RWY 33 ORIG B.

Forest City

Forest City Muni
Iowa
RNAV/RWY 33 ORIG...
Effective: 01/29/92
FDC 2/0505/FXY/FI/P Forest City Muni, Forest City, IA. RNAV RWY 33 ORIG ...Add note... Circling to RWY 27 NA at night. Delete note...Activate MIRL...Thru...CTAF. This becomes RNAV/RWY 33 ORIG A.

International Falls

Falls Intl
Minnesota
VOR/DME OR TACAN RWY 31 AMDT 3...
Effective: 12/06/91
This corrects NOTAM IN TL 91–1...
FDC 1/6112/INL/FI/P Falls Intl, International Falls, MN. VOR/DME or TACAN RWY 31 AMDT 3...Delete notes, "Contact HIB FSS 123.6 for MALSR RWY 31. Activate HIRL RWY 13–31 and REIL RWY 13–122.8." This is VOR/DME or TACAN RWY 31 AMDT 3A.

Palmyra

Palmyra
New York
VOR–A ORIG...
Effective: 01/28/92
FDC 2/0495/6G3/ FI/P Palmyra, Palmyra, NY. VOR–A ORIG...Delete GEE 26.3 at map. This becomes VOR–A ORIG A.

Coatesville

Chester County G.O. Carlson
Pennsylvania
ILS RWY 29 AMDT 5...
Effective: 01/21/92
FDC 2/0332/40N/ FI/P Chester County G.O. Carlson, Coatesville, PA. ILS RWY 29 AMDT 5...Delete MM and DSTC MM to THR. This becomes ILS RWY 29 AMDT 5A.

Charleston

Charleston Executive
South Carolina
RNAV RWY 9, AMDT 5...
Effective: 01/15/92
FDC 2/0244/JZI/ FI/P Charleston Executive, Charleston, SC. RNAV RWY 9, AMDT 5...Min alt at 2 NM from map WPT 600. This becomes RNAV RWY 9 AMDT 5A.

Humboldt

Humboldt Muni
Tennessee
VOR/DME–A AMDT 4...
Effective: 12/17/91
FDC 1/6320/M52/ FI/P Humboldt Muni, Humboldt, TN. VOR/DME–A AMDT 4...Increase MSA to 2500 ft. This becomes VOR/DME–A AMDT 4A.

McMinnville

Warren County Memorial
Tennessee
NDB RWY 23 ORIG...
Effective: 01/16/92
FDC 2/0267/RNC/ FI/P Warren County Memorial, McMinnville TN. NDB RWY 23 ORIG...Delete LCL ALSTG MINS. Change note to read, "use Crossville ALSTG." This becomes NDB RWY 23 ORIG A.

McMinnville

Warren County Memorial
Tennessee
LOC RWY 23 ORIG...
Effective: 01/16/92
FDC 2/0274/RNC/ FI/P Warren County Memorial, McMinnville, TN. LOC RWY 23 ORIG...Delete LCL ALSTG MINS. Change note to read, "use Crossville ALSTG." ADF required. This becomes LOC RWY 23 ORIG A.

Memphis

Memphis International
Tennessee
ILS RWY 27 AMDT 1...
Effective: 01/21/92
FDC 2/0343/MEM/ FI/P Memphis International, Memphis, TN. ILS RWY 27 AMDT 1...MSA MEM VORTAC 315–135 2500...135–315 2000. This becomes ILS RWY 27 AMDT 1A.

Memphis

Memphis International
Tennessee
ILS RWY 18L AMDT 7...
Effective: 01/21/92
FDC 2/0344/MEM/ FI/P Memphis International, Memphis, TN. ILS RWY 18L AMDT 7...MSA MEM VORTAC 315–135 2500...135–315 2000. This becomes ILS RWY 18L AMDT 7A.

Memphis

Memphis International
Tennessee
VOR RWY 27 AMDT 1...
Effective: 01/21/92
FDC 2/0346/MEM/ FI/P Memphis International, Memphis Int'l, Memphis, TN. VOR RWY 27 AMDT 1...MSA MEM VORTAC 315–135 2500...135–315 2000. This becomes VOR RWY 27 AMDT 1A.

Memphis

Memphis Intl
Tennessee
NDB RWY 9 AMDT 25...
Effective: 01/22/92
FDC 2/0357/MEM/ FI/P Memphis Int'l, Memphis, TN. NDB RWY 9 AMDT 25...MSA ME LOM 315–135 2500...135–315 2000. This becomes NDB RWY 9 AMDT 25A.

Memphis

Memphis Intl
Tennessee
ILS RWY 9 AMDT 24...
Effective: 01/22/92
FDC 2/0358/MEM/ FI/P Memphis International, Memphis, TN. ILS RWY 9 AMDT 24...MSA ME LOM 315–135 2500...135–315 2000. This becomes ILS RWY 9 AMDT 24A.

[FR Doc. 92–3810 Filed 2–18–92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

---

14 CFR Part 97

[Docket No. 26762; Amdt. No. 1478]

Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment establishes, amends, suspends, or revokes Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) for operations at certain airports. These regulatory actions are needed because of the adoption of new or revised criteria, or because of changes occurring in the National Airspace System, such as the commissioning of new navigational facilities, addition of new obstacles, or changes in air traffic requirements. These changes are designed to provide safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace and to promote safe flight operations under instrument flight rules at the affected airports.

DATES: *Effective:* An effective date for each SIAP is specified in the amendatory provisions.

Incorporation by reference—approved by the Director of the Federal Register on December 31, 1980, and reapproved as of January 1, 1982.

ADDRESSES: Availability of matters incorporated by reference in the amendment is as follows:

For Examination—

1. FAA Rules Docket, FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591;
2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located; or
3. The Flight Inspection Field Office which originated the SIAP.

For Purchase—

Individual SIAP copies may be obtained from:

1. FAA Public Inquiry Center (APA–200), FAA Headquarters Building, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; or
2. The FAA Regional Office of the region in which the affected airport is located.

By Subscription—

Copies of all SIAPs, mailed once every 2 weeks, are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Best, Flight Procedures Standards Branch (AFS–420), Technical Programs Division, Flight Standards Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267–8277.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amendment to part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 97) establishes, amends, suspends, or revokes Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs). The complete regulatory description of each SIAP is contained in official FAA form documents which are incorporated by reference in this amendment under 5 U.S.C. 552(a), 1 CFR part 51, and § 97.20 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR). The applicable FAA Forms are identified as FAA Forms 8260–3, 8260–4, and 8260–5. Materials incorporated by reference are available for examination or purchase as stated above.

The large number of SIAPs, their complex nature, and the need for a special format make their verbatim publication in the **Federal Register** expensive and impractical. Further, airmen do not use the regulatory text of the SIAPs, but refer to their graphic depiction on charts printed by publishers of aeronautical materials. Thus, the advantages of incorporation by reference are realized and publication of the complete description of each SIAP contained in FAA form documents is unnecessary. The provisions of this amendment state the affected CFR (and FAR) sections, with the types and effective dates of the SIAPs. This amendment also identifies the airport, its location, the procedure identification and the amendment number.

This amendment to part 97 is effective upon publication of each separate SIAP as contained in the transmittal. Some SIAP amendments may have been previously issued by the FAA in a National Flight Data Center (FDC) Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) as an emergency action of immediate flight safety relating directly to published aeronautical charts. The circumstances which created the need for some SIAP amendments may require making them effective in less than 30 days. For the remaining SIAPs, an effective date at least 30 days after publication is provided.

Further, the SIAPs contained in this amendment are based on the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Approach Procedures (TERPs). In developing these SIAPs, the TERPS criteria were applied to the conditions existing or anticipated at the affected airports. Because of the close and immediate relationship between these SIAPs and safety in air commerce, I find that notice and public procedure before adopting these SIAPs are unnecessary, impracticable, and contrary to the public interest and, where applicable, that good cause exists for making some SIAPs effective in less than 30 days.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore—(1) is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. For the same reason, the FAA certifies that this amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 97

Air traffic control, Airports, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (Air), Standard instrument approaches, Weather.

Issued in Washington, DC on January 31, 1992.

Thomas C. Accardi,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 97) is amended by establishing, amending, suspending, or revoking Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 UTC on the dates specified, as follows:

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for part 97 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348, 1354(a), 1421 and 1510; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.49(b)(2).

2. Part 97 is amended to read as follows:

§§ 97.23, 97.25, 97.27, 97.29, 97.31, 97.33, 97.35 [Amended]

By amending: § 97.23 VOR, VOR/DME, VOR or TACAN, and VOR/DME or TACAN; § 97.25 LOC, LOC/DME, LDA, LDA/DME, SDF, SDF/DME; § 97.27 NDB, NDB/DME; § 97.29 ILS, ILS/DME, ISMLS, MLS, MLS/DME, MLS/RNAV; § 97.31 RADAR SIAPs; § 97.33 RNAV SIAPs; and § 97.35 COPTER SIAPs, identified as follows:

** * * Effective April 30, 1992*

Springdale, AR—Springdale Muni, VOR RWY 18, Amdt. 12

Springdale, AR—Springdale Muni, VOR/DME RWY 36, Amdt. 6

Springdale, AR—Springdale Muni, ILS RWY 18, Amdt. 3
Camarillo, CA—Camarillo, VOR RWY 26, Amdt. 3
Belleville, KS—Belleville Muni, VOR/DME-, Amdt. 2
Belleville, KS—Belleville Muni, NDB RWY 18, Amdt. 4
Belleville, KS—Belleville Muni, NDB RWY 36, Amdt. 4
Russellville, KY—Russellville-Logan County, VOR/DME RWY 24, Amdt. 5
Hammond, LA—Hammond Muni, VOR RWY 18 Amdt. 2
Hammond, LA—Hammond Muni, VOR RWY 31, Amdt. 3
Hammond, LA—Hammond Muni, NDB RWY 18, Amdt. 2
Hammond, LA—Hammond Muni, ILS RWY 18, Amdt. 2
Marksville, LA—Marksville Municipal, VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 2
Easton, MD—Easton Muni, NDB RWY 22, Amdt. 8
Kaiser/Lake Ozark, MO—Lee C. Fine Memorial, LOC/DME RWY 21, Amdt. 1
Nevada, MO—Nevada Muni, VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 1
Nevada, MO—Nevada Muni, NDB RWY 20, Amdt. 2
Nevada, MO—Nevada Muni, VOR/DME RNAV RWY 20, Amdt. 1
Anaconda, MT—Anaconda, VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 1
Omaha, NE—Millard, VOR/DME RNAV RWY 12, Amdt. 6
Watonga, OK—Watonga, VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 2
Watonga, OK—Watonga, NDB RWY 17, Orig.
Coleman, TX—Coleman Muni, NDB RWY 15, Amdt. 1
Clarksburg, WV—Benedum, VOR RWY 3, Amdt. 14
Clarksburg, WV—Benedum, ILS RWY 21, Amdt. 12

** * * Effective March 5, 1992*

Emmonak, AK—Emmonak, VOR RWY 16, Orig.
Emmonak, AK—Emmonak, VOR RWY 34, Orig.
Nome, AK—Nome, VOR/DME RWY 9, Amdt. 4, CANCELLED
Nome, AK—Nome, VOR RWY 27, Amdt. 11, CANCELLED
Nome, AK—Nome, NDB RWY 27, Amdt. 3, CANCELLED
Angola, IN—Tri-State Steuben County, NDB RWY 5, Amdt. 6
Fort Wayne, IN—Fort Wayne Muni (Baer Field), NDB RWY 32, Amdt. 24
Fort Wayne, IN—Fort Wayne Muni (Baer Field), ILS RWY 32, Amdt. 27
Goshen, IN—Goshen Muni, VOR RWY 27, Amdt. 5
Goshen, IN—Goshen Muni, ILS/DME RWY 27, Amdt. 1
Huntingburg, IN—Huntingburg, VOR RWY 9, Amdt. 2
Huntingburg, IN—Huntingburg, VOR RWY 27, Amdt. 2
Huntingburg, IN—Huntingburg, NDB RWY 27, Amdt. 2
Seymour, IN—Freeman Muni, LOC RWY 5, Amdt. 2
Seymour, IN—Freeman Muni, NDB RWY 5, Amdt. 2
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, VOR RWY 23, Amdt. 19
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, VOR/DME RWY 5, Amdt. 16
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, LOC BC RWY 23, Amdt. 18
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, NDB RWY 5, Amdt. 18
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, ILS RWY 5, Amdt. 22
Terre Haute, IN—Hulman Regional, RADAR-1 Amdt. 3
Estherville, IA—Estherville Muni, VOR RWY 16, Amdt. 4
Estherville, IA—Estherville Muni, VOR RWY 34, Amdt. 6
Eureka, KS—Eureka Muni, VOR/DME RWY 18, Amdt. 1
Lake Charles, LA—Lake Charles Regional, VOR-A, Amdt. 13
Bellaire, MI—Antrim County, VOR RWY 2, Amdt. 2
Bellaire, MI—Antrim County, NDB RWY 2, Amdt. 2
Benton Harbor, MI—Ross Field-Twin Cities, VOR RWY 27, Amdt. 18
Charlotte, MI—Fitch H. Beach, VOR RWY 20, Amdt. 9
Harbor Springs, MI—Harbor Springs, VOR-A, Amdt. 1
Sparta, MI—Sparta, VOR/DME RNAV RWY 24, Amdt. 2
Ramsey, MN—Gateway North Industrial, VOR RWY 34, Orig., CANCELLED
Two Harbors, MN—Two Harbors Municipal, NDB RWY 24, Orig.
Warroad, MN—Warroad Intel-Swede Carlson Field, NDB RWY 31, Amdt. 6
Warroad, MN—Warroad Intl-Swede Carlson Field, VOR/DME RNAV RWY 31, Amdt. 2
Wapakoneta, OH—Neil Armstong, VOR-A, Amdt. 5
Wapakoneta, OH—Neil Armstrong, VOR/DME RNAV RWY 26, Amdt. 3
Pierre, SD—Pierre Muni, VOR/DME or TACAN RWY 7, Amdt. 4
Pierre, SD—Pierre Muni, VOR/DME or TACAN RWY 25, Amdt. 16
Pierre, SD—Pierre Muni, ILS RWY 31, Amdt. 9
Laredo, TX—Laredo Intl, VOR or TACAN RWY 32, Amdt. 9
Sturgeon Bay, WI—Door County Cherryland, SDF RWY 1, Amdt. 5
Sturgeon Bay, WI—Door County Cherryland, NDB RWY 1, Amdt. 9

** * * Effective January 28, 1992*

Port Clinton, OH—Carl R Keller Field, NDB RWY 27, Amdt. 9

[FR Doc. 92-3811 Filed 2-18-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[T.D. 8389]
RIN 1545-AP72

Taxation of Fringe Benefits and Exclusions From Gross Income of Certain Fringe Benefits; Correction

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service, Treasury.

ACTION: Correction to final regulations.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the final regulations (T.D. 8389), which were published Thursday, January 16, 1992, [57 FR 1868]. The regulations contain final amendments of two provisions of the fringe benefit regulations concerning the taxation and valuation of fringe benefits and exclusion from gross income for certain fringe benefits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 16, 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marianna Dyson at 202-377-9372, not a toll free call).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The final regulations that are the subject of these corrections contain final amendments to the fringe benefit regulations under sections 61 and 132 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (Code).

Need for Correction

As published, the final regulations contain errors which may prove to be misleading and are in need of clarification.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication of the final regulations (T.D. 8389), which was the subject of FR Doc. 91-1116, is corrected as follows:

Paragraph 1. On page 1869, column 1, fifth line from bottom of the second full paragraph, the language "employees earning $121,070, or more. For" is corrected to read "employee earning $121,070, or more. For".

Par. 2. On page 1869, column 3, under the heading "Alternative Transportation: Walking or Using Public Transportation", third paragraph, line 15, the language "alternative mode of transportation" is corrected to read "alternative modes of transportation."

Par. 3. On page 1872, column 1, in § 1.132-6, paragraph (d)(1), line 1, the language "similar instruments that is exchangeable" is corrected to read

"similar instrument that is exchangeable".

Cynthia E. Grigsby,

Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate).

[FR Doc. 92-3766 Filed 2-18-92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 943

Texas Permanent Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Final rule; approval of proposed amendment.

SUMMARY: OSM is announcing its decision to approve a proposed amendment to the Texas permanent regulatory program (hereinafter, the "Texas program") under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The amendment pertains to Texas' self-bonding regulations. The amendment is intended to provide additional safeguards and improve operational efficiency.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 19, 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James H. Moncrief, Telephone (918) 581-6430.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Texas Program

On February 16, 1980, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Texas program. General background information on the Texas program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval of the Texas program, can be found in the February 27, 1980, **Federal Register** (45 FR 12998). Subsequent actions concerning the Texas program and program amendments are codified at 30 CFR 943.15 and 943.16.

II. Proposed Amendment

By letter dated June 24, 1991 (Administrative Record No. TX-493), Texas submitted a proposed amendment to its program under SMCRA. Texas submitted the proposed amendment on its own initiative. Texas proposed to amend Texas Coal Mining Regulation (TCMR) 806.309(j), concerning self-bonding.

OSM announced receipt of the proposed amendment in the July 9, 1991, **Federal Register** (56 FR 31094) and in the same notice opened the public comment period and offered to hold a public hearing on the adequacy of the proposed amendment (Administrative Record No. TX-498). Mr. Hayward Rigano, a representative of Titus County Citizens An Endangered Species, Inc., requested an opportunity to testify at a public hearing. Because there was only one request, OSM held a public meeting rather than a hearing in Austin, Texas, on August 5, 1991. OSM entered a summary of the public meeting into the administrative record (Administrative Record Nos. TX-502 and TX-521). The public comment period closed on August 8, 1991.

During its review of the amendment, OSM identified concerns relating to TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(H), definition of "SIC code"; TCMR 806.309(j)(2), requirements for business and governmental entities; and TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C), financial information requirements. OSM notified Texas of the concerns by letter dated September 16, 1991 (Administrative Record No. TX-506). Texas responded in a letter dated October 8, 1991, by submitting a revised amendment (Administrative Record No. TX-505). The regulations that Texas proposed to revise were TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(H), definition of "SIC code"; TCMR 806.309(j)(2), requirements for business and governmental entities; and TCMR 806.309(j)(3)(C), financial information requirements.

OSM published a notice in the October 29, 1991, **Federal Register** (56 FR 55843) reopening the comment period on the proposed amendment. OSM did so to provide the public the opportunity to reconsider the adequacy of the proposed amendment (Administrative Record No. TX-509). The reopened comment period ended on November 13, 1991.

III. Director's Findings

After a thorough review, pursuant to SMCRA, 30 U.S.C. 1201-1328, and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 732.15 and 732.17, the Director finds that the proposed amendment as submitted by Texas on June 24, 1991, and as revised by it on October 8, 1991, is no less stringent than SMCRA and no less effective than the corresponding Federal regulations.

1. Substantive Revisions to Texas' Program That Are Substantively Identical to the Corresponding Federal Regulations

Texas proposed revisions to the following regulations that are substantive in nature and contain language that is substantively identical to the corresponding Federal regulations (listed in parentheses):

TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(I) (30 CFR 800.23(a)), definition of "tangible net worth;" TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iii) (30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(iii)), financial criteria; TCMR 806.309(j)(7) (30 CFR 800.23(f)), current financial information; and TCMR 806.309(j)(8) (30 CFR 800.23(g)), substitute bonding.

Because the proposed revisions to these Texas regulations are substantively identical to the corresponding Federal regulations, the Director finds that these proposed Texas regulations are no less effective than the corresponding Federal regulations. Therefore, the Director approves these proposed regulations.

2. TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(H), Definition of "SIC Code"

Texas proposed at TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(H) to define "SIC code" to mean:

> The standard industrial classification used by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation to identify various industry groups such as electric utility companies. Data identified by SIC code is to be the current data for the last annual period compiled and reported by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation.

The SIC code is an index devised to categorize and identify businesses according to the specific lines of business activity being conducted. Texas uses "SIC code" at proposed TCMR 806(j)(2)(C)(iv) to identify specific financial information that a self-bonding applicant must provide to the Railroad Commission of Texas (the Commission).

The Federal regulations at 30 CFR chapter VII, including the corresponding Federal self-bonding regulations at 30 CFR 800.23, do not define or use the term "SIC code." The Director finds that Texas' proposed definition of "SIC code" at TCMR 806.309(j)(1)(H) is not inconsistent with the Federal self-bonding regulations at 30 CFR part 800 or with Section 509(c) of SMCRA. Therefore, the Director approves this definition.

3. TCMR 806.309(j)(2) and (j)(2)(B), Requirements for Business and Governmental Entities

Texas proposed to revise existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2) by (1) adding the words "or governmental," so that the regulation reads "(t)he Commission may accept a self-bond from an applicant that is a business *or governmental entity* if all the following conditions are met * * *" (emphasis added), and (2) deleting the references to "business entity" from existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(B) and (B)(ii). The proposed revisions would then require any self-bonding applicant, whether a business

entity or a governmental entity, to meet all of the regulatory requirements for eligibility to self-bond found at TCMR 806.309(j)(2), including the continuous operation requirements at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(B).

The Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23 provide that the regulatory authority may accept a self-bond from an applicant for a permit to conduct surface coal mining and reclamation operations if the applicant meets all of the conditions specified at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(1) through (4). The Federal regulations refer only to an "applicant" and do not specify, as Texas proposes, that an applicant is a governmental or business entity. Because all applicants, whether they are governmental or business entities, must meet the specified conditions which are substantively identical to the Federal requirements at 30 CFR 800.23(b) and (b)(2), the Director finds that Texas' proposed regulations at TCMR 806.309(j)(2) and (j)(2)(B) are no less effective than the corresponding Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b) and (b)(2) and approves them.

4. TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv), Alternate Eligibility Criteria

The Texas regulations at TCMR 806.309(j)(2) set forth four conditions that an applicant must meet in order to be eligible to self-bond. The condition at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C) requires an applicant to submit information that demonstrates the applicant's financial strength and solvency. Texas proposed, at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv), an additional criterion which an applicant could meet to satisfy this condition. The proposed criterion consists of four parts and requires that the applicant submit financial information in sufficient detail to show that:

(I) (t)he applicant has an investment-grade rating for its most recent bond issuance of "Baa" or higher from Moody's Investor Service and "BBB-" or higher from Standard and Poor's Corporation; and

(II) (t)he applicant has a tangible net worth of at least $10 million and fixed assets in the United States totalling at least $20 million; and

(III) (t)he applicant has a ratio of total liabilities to net worth that is equal to or less than the industry median reported by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation for the applicant's primary SIC code; and

(IV) (t)he applicant has a ratio of current assets to current liabilities that is equal to or greater than the industry median reported by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation for the applicant's primary SIC code; or the applicant has a current credit rating of '4A2' or higher from Dun and Bradstreet Corporation.

In order to be eligible to self-bond under proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C), the applicant would be required to satisfy one or more of the three existing criteria at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(i), (ii), and (iii), which are substantively identical to the corresponding Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(i), (ii), and (iii), or all four parts of the additional proposed criterion at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv). Each of the four parts is discussed separately below. The Director finds that the combined requirements of the four parts within Texas' proposed alternative self-bonding eligibility criterion at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv) provide the necessary safeguards for the bonding provisions of the Texas program. The Director finds that Texas' proposed regulations at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv) are no less effective than the corresponding Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3).

(a) Bond rating criterion. Texas' proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(I) would require an applicant to have a "rating for its most recent bond issuance of 'Baa' or higher from Moody's Investor Service and 'BBB–' or higher from Standard and Poor's Corporation." Bonds carrying these ratings are considered to be investment-grade bonds. As a matter of clarification, Standard and Poor's Corporation uses plus (+) and minus (−) designations for its bond ratings to indicate the relative standing among bond issuances of the same letter designation (e.g., A+, A, and A–).

Existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(i) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(i) require the applicant to have a current rating for its most recent bond issuance of "A" or higher as issued by either Moody's Investor Service or Standard and Poor's Corporations. In the preamble to its proposed rule, OSM discussed at length its rationale for this bond rating criterion. OSM cited a 1981 study of financial tests for owners or operators of hazardous waste facilities, prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Environmental Protection Agency, 1981, Background Document for the Financial Test and Municipal Revenue Test for Financial Assurance for Closure and Post-Closure Care, EPA), which found that firms receiving any of the four highest ratings from Moody's (Aaa, Aa, A, Baa) or Standard and Poor's (AAA, AA, A, BBB) bond rating services show financial strength equal to that of firms qualifying under certain other financial ratio tests (47 FR 36570, 36572, August 20, 1982). "Partly as a result of this study, EPA adopted rules (47 FR 15032, April 7, 1982) which require that an applicant for financial assurance tests have $10 million of tangible net worth and certain other financial criteria, in addition to the appropriate bond rating" (47 FR 36570, 36572, August 20, 1982).

The preamble explained that "(s)ince OSM would not be requiring the double proof of solvency—the $10 million tangible net worth in conjunction with the bond rating criterion—the bond rating would have to be in the top three ratings from Moody's (Aaa, Aa, A) or Standard and Poor's (AAA, AA, A)," instead of the top four. In doing so, OSM did not discuss whether a lower bond rating criterion could constitute an adequate test for financial strength, if combined with additional financial tests.

Although Texas' proposed regulation would allow Texas to accept bonds with lower ratings than existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(i) and the Federal regulation at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(i), proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv), unlike its Federal counterpart, would require an adequate rating by both specified rating services rather than just one (proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(I)). It would also require the applicant to meet a tangible net worth test and a fixed assets in the United States test (proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(I)), a total liabilities to net worth test (proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(III)), and either a ratio of current assets to current liabilities test (current ratio) or a credit rating test (proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(IV)).

(b) Tangible net worth and fixed assets in the United States criteria. Texas' proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(II) would require an applicant to have a tangible net worth of at least $10 million, and fixed assets in the United States of at least $20 million. Existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(ii) and (iii) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(ii) and (iii) include identical amounts for tangible net worth and fixed assets in the United States.

c. Ratio of total liabilities to net worth and ratio of current assets to current liabilities criteria. Texas' proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(III) would require an applicant to have a ratio of total liabilities to net worth that is equal to or less than the industry median reported by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation for the applicant's primary SIC code. Texas' proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(IV) would require an applicant to have (1) a current ratio that is equal to or greater than the industry median reported by Dun and Bradstreet for the applicant's primary SIC code or (2) a composite credit rating of "4A2" or higher from Dun and Bradstreet.

Existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(ii) and (iii) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3)(ii) and (iii) require that the applicant have a ratio of total liabilities to net worth of 2.5 times or less, and a current ratio of 1.2 times or greater.

OSM's decision to include these financial ratio requirements in its self-bonding regulations was based largely on the requirements in EPA's financial assurance rules for closure and post-closure of hazardous waste facilities and the background documents supporting those rules. However, OSM modified the qualifying ratio values from those established by EPA to reflect industry ratio values for the coal industry which were supplied by Dun and Bradstreet because such ratio values "better reflect industry norms for coal mining companies" (48 FR 36418, 36423, August 10, 1983). Thus, the coal industry median values reported by Dun and Bradstreet Corporation at the time the Federal requirements were established were the source of OSM's qualifying value of 2.5 or less for the ratio of total liabilities to net worth and its qualifying value of 1.2 or higher for the current ratio.

Texas' proposed requirements would differ from the existing Texas regulations at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C) (ii) and (iii) and the Federal requirements at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3) (ii) and (iii) in two important ways: (1) The qualifying ratio values would be keyed to industry median ratios for the specific industry identified by the applicant's primary SIC code, rather than to the coal industry alone, and (2) the qualifying ratio values would not be static values, but would be at any given time equal to the appropriate industry median ratio values.

The effect of Texas' proposed qualifying values for the ratio of total liabilities to net worth and the current ratio would be to ensure that a self-bonding applicant is performing favorably in comparison to the rest of its industry with respect to these ratios, and to ensure that the qualifying ratio values reflect current industry conditions. Reliance on financial information that is specific to the applicant's primary industry is consistent with OSM's use of coal industry medians to establish its qualifying values for the ratio of total liabilities to net worth and the current ratio.

Although the use of qualifying ratio values that are keyed to corresponding industry median values would usually provide more a stringent test than the current Federal ratio values, current industry median values may impose less stringent requirements than the Federal regulations under some economic circumstances. However, under proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv), a self-bonding applicant would be required at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv) (I) and (II) to meet other financial strength and solvency tests in addition to meeting the total liabilities to net worth and current ratio tests. Further, existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2) provides that the Commission may accept a self-bond from an applicant if the applicant meets the specified conditions. Because TCMR 806.309(j)(2) does not require the Commission to accept the self-bond of every applicant that meets the requirements of TCMR 806.309(j), the Commission has discretion to refuse a self-bond if, for some reason, it determines that those financial tests do not provide an accurate assessment of the applicant's financial strength and solvency.

(d) Current credit rating as an alternative criterion. Texas proposed at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(iv)(IV) that an applicant could use, as an alternative to satisfying the current ratio test, "a current credit rating of '4A2' or higher from Dun and Bradstreet Corporation." The "current credit rating" is called the D&B Rating System in the literature and reports of Dun and Bradstreet Corporation.

Dun and Bradstreet Corporation's rating system uses a two-part code to represent a company's financial strength and credit appraisal. The financial strength is expressed as tangible net worth in 14 classes ranging from less than $5,000 to greater than $50 million. The "4A" in Texas' proposed "4A2" qualifying rating indicates a tangible net worth of $10 million to $49.99 million (Dun & Bradstreet Reference Book of American Business, November-December, 1991). This range is consistent with Texas' existing TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C)(ii) and the Federal regulation at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3) (ii), which require a tangible net worth of at least $10 million.

The credit appraisal portion of Dun and Bradstreet's rating system code (the "2" of Texas' proposed "4A2" qualifying rating) is a numerical rating from "1" to "4" with "1" being the highest or most favorable rating. Dun and Bradstreet's credit appraisal is based on the evaluation of a number of factors. The main factor considered is the company's financial condition. This evaluation utilizes "industry norm" data, financial ratios including current ratio and ratio of total liabilities to net worth, trend information, operating numbers, and cash flow. Other factors considered include banking relationships, lawsuits, liens, judgments, background of the company, and the experience level of the management. Because the credit appraisal is based on a comprehensive analysis of the company, including consideration of the company's current ratio, Texas' proposed "2" rating provides a level of assurance that is equal or better than that provided by the current ratio alone.

5. TCMR 806.309(j)(3), Requirements for a Governmental Entity

Texas proposed to delete TCMR 806.309(j)(3), which provides separate eligibility criteria for governmental entities applying to self-bond. Texas originally proposed TCMR 806.309(j)(3) on August 29, 1988, revised it on March 21, 1989, and promulgated it on September 18, 1989. OSM subsequently found the regulation to be less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(b)(3) (ii) and (iii), and 800.23(d), and did not approve it (54 FR 50750, 50752, December 11, 1989).

Because OSM previously found TCMR 806.309(j)(3) to be less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(a)(ii) and (iii), and (d), and did not approve it, the Director finds that Texas' proposed deletion of this provision would make this part of the Texas program consistent with the Federal regulations. Therefore, the Director approves the proposed deletion of TCMR 806.309(j)(3).

6. TCMR 806.309(j)(9), Applicability

On August 29, 1988, Texas proposed to add at TCMR 806.309(j)(9) provisions by which the Commission could waive the proposed self-bonding requirements at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C) and (j)(4). On March 21, 1989, Texas proposed to revise TCMR 806.309(j)(9) to provide that the proposed requirements at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C), (j)(3)(E), and (j)(5) would apply only to new self-bonding applicants. Existing self-bonded permittees would be allowed to increase their self-bonds without meeting the financial eligibility criteria of the proposed regulations. On September 18, 1989, Texas promulgated the proposed revisions at TCMR 806.309(j)(9). OSM subsequently found the regulation to be less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23, and did not approve it (54 FR 50750, 50752, December 11, 1989).

In this amendment, Texas proposed to delete TCMR 806.309(j)(9). However, the language Texas proposed to delete differs from the language that OSM did not approve on December 11, 1989, in that it provides, in part, that the requirements at TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C),

(j)(3)(E), and (j)(5) would apply to modifications of existing self-bonds.

The Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23(g) require that any time the financial conditions of the permittee change so that the financial criteria to self-bond are not met, the permittee must notify the regulatory authority and post an alternate form of bond. Existing TCMR 806.309(j)(8) has the same requirements. Therefore, even though Texas removes language from its program that requires the provisions of TCMR 806.309(j)(2)(C), (j)(3)(E), and (j)(5) to be applied to modifications of existing self-bonds, the Texas program retains these requirements at TCMR 806.309(j)(8). The Director approves Texas' proposed deletion of TCMR 806.309(j)(9).

IV. Public and Agency Comments

Following are summaries of all substantive oral and written comments on the proposed amendment that were received by OSM and the Director's responses to them.

Public Comments

Two commenters provided written support for the proposed amendment (Administrative Record Nos. TX–499 and TX–501).

Two persons testified at the public meeting held in Austin, Texas, on August 5, 1991. One stated that existing State and Federal self-bonding requirements are appropriate for coal mining companies but not for electric power utilities. This person presented a document entitled "Comparisons of Bond Rating and Current Ratios" (Administrative Record No. TX–502) and referred to it in support of his statement that there is no clear relationship between a high bond rating and meeting the financial ratios in the current regulations. The commenter also stated that bond ratings were better indicators than financial ratios of a company's financial health. This commenter said that the proposed rules fairly assess a company's financial health and that the commenter supported the proposed amendment. By letter dated August 27, 1991, this commenter submitted to OSM a document entitled "Comparison of Electric Utility Company Bond Ratings and Current Ratios" (Administrative Record No. TX–503) stating that this was a revised version of the document presented at the public meeting. The Director acknowledges these comments in support of the proposed amendment.

The other commenter said that a cash bond should be required to cover all probable effects of mining and that self-bonding should not be allowed because the Texas mining companies were potentially at risk far beyond their ability to pay. The commenter said that large companies can go bankrupt and that the proposed rule should not be approved.

The Director acknowledges these concerns. However, the concerns are not within the scope of this rulemaking. Rather than addressing whether or not Texas should accept self-bonds from mining companies, or the required bond amount, the amendment proposes an additional criterion under which the Commission may accept a self-bond from an applicant. Section 25(c) of Texas Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act (TSCMRA) already provides that the Commission may accept an applicant's self-bond when the applicant adequately demonstrates the existence of a history of financial solvency and continuous operation. Also, Texas' approved regulations at TCMR 806.308(a) prescribe a self-bond as a valid form of the required performance bond. These provisions provide the Commission with the discretion to allow or disapprove self-bond applications on a case-by-case basis (48 FR 36418, 36428, August 10, 1983) and are consistent with the provisions of Section 509(c) of SMCRA and Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.12.

The same commenter also questioned the wisdom of allowing particular Texas companies to self-bond and cited specific financial difficulties such companies were, or could potentially be, facing. For example, the commenter was concerned that a proposed fly ash disposal and reclamation plan at a specific mine may potentially result in severe environmental damage that would require remedies, thereby exposing the Texas mining companies to future high financial liability. The commenter said that health risks present another area of financial exposure to the mining companies and cited a soon-to-be-published research study that the commenter said will show significant environmental effects to Titus County citizens. The commenter also was concerned that power plant construction costs may seriously deplete mining company resources, and referred to a newspaper article about the high cost of constructing the Comanche Creek power plant. Another concern was that the artificial maintenance of reclaimed lands would be so costly that the companies would not be required to do it.

The Director acknowledges these concerns. However, the present rulemaking is not the proper forum, for determining whether any particular Texas company should be allowed to self-bond. Once a particular company meets all of the prerequisites for self-bonding at 806.309(j)(2), the determination of whether the company should be allowed to self-bond is a matter within the Commission's discretion. The Commission can refuse to allow a company to self-bond, despite the fact that the company satisfies the criteria of 806.309(j)(2), if the Commission determines that those financial tests do not provide an accurate assessment of the applicant's financial strength and solvency.

Further, Texas' regulations at TCMR 805.304 prescribe the requirements for determining the bond amount. The bond amount is determined by the Commission on the basis of, among other things, the probable difficulty of reclamation considering such factors as the topography, geology, and hydrology of the site and its revegetation potential. OSM believes that these existing provisions in the Texas program provide adequate requirements and safeguards for evaluating an individual applicant's financial capacity to self-bond and determining bond amounts.

This same commenter also felt that the proposed regulations should specify the accounting methods to be used because a company's stated financial condition may vary depending on the accounting method used. On August 10, 1983, the Director published a final rule **Federal Register** notice promulgating Federal regulations at 30 CFR 800.23 pertaining to self-bonding (48 FR 36418). These regulations were subsequently revised on January 14, 1988 (53 FR 994). The Federal regulations do not require that financial information submitted by an applicant conform to specific accounting methods. In this proposed amendment, Texas has incorporated requirements in its regulations that are no less effective than the corresponding Federal regulations concerning the integrity of financial information and financial statements submitted. Therefore, the Director is not requiring Texas to revise its regulations in response to this comment.

Agency Comments

Pursuant to 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(i), OSM solicited comments from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and various other Federal agencies with an actual or potential interest in the Texas program.

The Bureau of Mines, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, and Bureau of Land Management responded that they had no specific comments, questions or recommended changes on the proposed amendment (Administrative Record

Nos. TX–495, TX–500 and TX–511, TX–508).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers responded that it found the proposed amendment satisfactory (Administrative Record No. TX–512).

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Concurrence

Pursuant to 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(ii), OSM is required to obtain the written concurrence of the Administrator of the EPA with the respect to any provisions of a State program amendment that relate to air or water quality standards promulgated under the authority of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*) or the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*)

None of the changes that Texas proposed to its rules pertain to air or water quality standards. Nevertheless, OSM requested EPA's concurrence on the proposed amendment (Administrative Record No. TX–497). On January 21, 1992, EPA gave written concurrence (Administrative Record No. TX–519).

State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Comments

Pursuant to 30 CFR 732.17(h)(4), OSM is required to solicit comments from the SHPO and ACHP for all amendments that may have an effect on historic properties. The Director solicited comments from these offices. The SHPO responded that there were no specific concerns or issues to present at this time (Administrative Record No. TX–510). ACHP did not respond.

V. Director's Decision

Based on the above findings, the Director approves the proposed amendment as submitted by Texas on June 24, 1991, and revised by it on October 8, 1991. The Director approves the rules with the provision that they be fully promulgated in identical form to the rules submitted to and reviewed by OSM and the public.

The Federal regulations at 30 CFR part 943 codifying decisions concerning the Texas program are being amended to implement this decision. This final rule is being made effective immediately to expedite the State program amendment process and to encourage States to bring their programs into conformity with the Federal standards without undue delay. Consistency of State and Federal standards is required by SMCRA.

VI. Procedural Determinations

National Environmental Policy Act

Pursuant to Section 702(d) of SMCRA, 30 U.S.C. 1292(d), no environmental impact statement need be prepared on this rulemaking.

Executive Order 12291 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act

On July 12, 1984, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) granted OSM an exemption from sections 3, 4, 7, and 8 of Executive Order 12291 for actions directly related to approval or conditional approval of State regulatory programs. Accordingly, for this section OSM is exempt from the requirement to prepare a regulatory impact analysis, and this action does not require a regulatory review by OMB. The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). This rule will not impose any new requirements; rather, it will ensure that existing requirements established by SMCRA and the Federal rules will be met by the State.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements which require approval by OMB under 44 U.S.C. 3507.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 943

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: February 4, 1992.

Raymond L. Lowrie,

Assistant Director, Western Support Center.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, title 30, chapter VII, subchapter T of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as set forth below:

PART 943—TEXAS

1. The authority citation for part 943 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*

4. Section 943.15 is amended by adding a new paragraph (e) as follows:

§ 943.15 Approval of regulatory program amendments.

* * * * *

(e) The revisions to the following Coal Mining Regulations of the Railroad Commission of Texas as submitted on June 24, 1991, and revised on October 8, 1991, are approved effective February 19, 1992:

Definitions of "SIC code" and "tangible net worth".	806.309(j)(1) (H) and (I).
Business and governmental entities.	806.309(j)(2), (j)(2)(B), (j)(2)(C)(iii) and (iv).
Governmental entities (deleted and reserved).	806.309(j)(3).
Current financial information.	806.309(j)(7).
Substitute bonding.....	806.309(j)(8).
Applicability (deleted).	806.309(j)(9).

[FR Doc. 92–3827 Filed 2–18–92; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

Bureau of Land Management

43 CFR Public Land Order 6923

[AZ–930–4214–10; AZAR–05059]

Partial Revocation of Public Land Order No. 1176; Arizona

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Public Land Order.

SUMMARY: This order revokes a public land order insofar as it affects 103.75 acres of National Forest System land withdrawn for use as the Lakeside Administrative Site. A portion of the site is no longer needed for this purpose, and the revocation is needed to permit disposal of the land through land exchange under the General Exchange Act of 1922. This action will open the land to such forms of disposition as may by law be made of National Forest System land. The land remains temporarily closed to mining by a Forest Service exchange proposal. The land has been and will remain open to mineral leasing.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 20, 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Mezes, BLM Arizona State Office, P.O. Box 16563, Phoenix, Arizona 85011, 602–640–5509.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714 (1988), it is ordered as follows:

1. Public Land Order No. 1176, which withdrew National Forest System land for use as the Lakeside Administrative Site, is hereby revoked insofar as it affects the following described land:

Gila and Salt River Meridian

Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest

T. 9 N., R. 22 E.,